



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/810,766 | 03/26/2004 | Geoffrey R. Kruse | M61.12-0629 | 9088 |

27366 7590 11/10/2008

WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
SUITE 1400
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-3244

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

CAO, PHUONG THAO

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

2164

| | |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

11/10/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. 10/810,766 | Applicant(s) KRUSE ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Phuong-Thao Cao | Art Unit 2164 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Phuong-Thao Cao, Examiner. (3) Alan Rego, Agent (Reg. No. 45,956).

(2) Hung Vy, Primary Examiner. (4) Geoffrey Schlueter, Applicant.

Date of Interview: 05 November 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: Claim 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Bedell et al. (US Patent No 6,996,568).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed the claimed invention and the distinction between the claimed invention and the cited reference. Examiners indicated that many of the discussed features weren't specify in the claimed language. No agreement had been reached. Applicant requested another interview to discuss a proposed amendment to further specify the claimed invention and Examiners agreed to schedule another interview when needed.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

| | |
|--|--|
| /Hung T Vy/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2163 | |
|--|--|